



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,308	09/12/2003	Ligang Lu	Y0R920030214US1 (16750)	7831
7590	07/06/2007	STEVEN FISCHMAN, ESQ. SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY AND PRESSER 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA GARDEN CITY, NY 11530	EXAMINER PHILIPPE, GIMS S	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER PAPER
			MAIL DATE 07/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/661,308	LU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Gims S. Philippe	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5-9, 13-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 10-12 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152..

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date, \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment received on April 30, 2007 in which claims 5 and 7 were amended, and claims 1-4 were canceled, and claims 13-17 were added, has been fully considered and entered but the arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 7, 13-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang (US Patent no. 6,643,327).

Regarding claims 13 and 17, Wang discloses the same method for transcoding an input compressed signal stream to an output compressed signal stream comprising performing adaptive frame rate transcoding for a sub-GOP (See Wang col. 9, lines 20-36), said sub-GOP comprising one or more types of frames of said input compressed signal stream to be transcoded (See col. 9, lines 29-52).

As per claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 13. In addition, Wang further discloses the same method wherein the video streams are compressed pursuant to the MPEG standard within a GOP wherein three types of pictures are distinguished according to the compression method which is used (See Wang col. 5, lines 33-51).

As per claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 13. In addition, Wang further implements rate distortion optimization within the sub-GOP (See Wang col. 4, lines 16-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 8-9 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (US Patent no. 6643327) in view of Panusopone et al. (US Patent no. 6647061).

Regarding claim 5, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 13.

It is noted that Wang is silent about downsampling motion vectors as specified in the claim.

However, Panusopone discloses an adaptive frame rate transcoding including the step of down-sampling motion vectors of the input compressed video stream (See Panusopone col. 16, lines 39-67 and col. 17, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Wang's input compressed video stream by incorporating Panusopone' step of down-sampling motion vectors of the input compressed video stream. The motivation for performing such a modification in Wang is to make the output blocks a low-pass of the input blocks as taught by Panusopone (See Panusopone col. 16, lines 24-27).

As per claims 8-9, 15-16, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 7.

It is noted that Wang is silent about skipping B pictures to be reconstructed at the decoder while encoding all the reference frames.

However, Panusopone discloses skipping B pictures to be reconstructed at the decoder while encoding all the reference frames (See Panusopone col. 18, lines 50-62).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Wang's transcoding steps by incorporating Panusopone's teachings of skipping B pictures to be reconstructed at the decoder while encoding all the reference frames. The motivation for performing such a modification in Wang is to reduce temporal redundancy as suggested by Panusopone (See col. 18, lines 42-50).

6. Claims 10-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2621

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S. Philippe whose telephone number is (571) 272-7336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dastouri Mehrdad can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Gims S Philippe  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

GSP

July 2, 2007